

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-12 are now in this application.

First, it is pointed out that by this amendment, former claim 10, which was indicated to be allowable in paragraph 11 of the Office action, has been incorporated into claim 1. Thus, claim 1 should now be allowable.

Further, the wording from previous claim 1 and claim 3 has been incorporated into claim 5, so that, as indicated in paragraph 11 of the Office action, claim 5 should now be allowable also.

With regard to the examiner's election of species requirement, it is pointed out that since claim 1 is now allowable, and it is generic to all of the claims, claims 4 and 6-9 can therefore be reinstated, and can be considered and allowed along with claim 1.

As to the examiner's various objections to the drawings and specification, it is noted that the wording from claim 13, as originally presented, has been incorporated into paragraph 30 of the specification. As part of this incorporation, only modifications so as to remove the claim format have been made. Thus, the examiner's objection that the specification does not support claim 1 is no longer valid. This modification to the specification was done in this fashion so that there would be no question of new matter with regard to the specification supporting claim 1, since this language was clearly part of the original disclosure, original claim 13.

Paragraph 30 of the specification has also had language added which recites the relationship of elements 34, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40. The examiner had objected to the specification for not reciting these elements which are shown in the drawings. Thus, the

examiner's objection as presented in paragraph 3 of the action is no longer valid.

With specific regard to the examiner's objections in paragraph 4 of the Office action, it is pointed out that now the specification does describe in paragraph 30 a travel measuring system, so that claim 1 is now clearly supported by the specification.

With regard to claim 2, this claim has been revised to a format with more correct grammar so that it is now supported by the specification.

With regard to the language in claim 1, which came from former claim 10, it is pointed out that the specification clearly does recite and disclose an operation wherein the bolt 7, which has a press fit within opening 5 of armature plate 2, is pressed through the opening 5 of the armature plate, by means of a pressing device 30, so that their relative position 21 can be adjusted until either first distance 24, or second distance 27, or for that matter any other desired distance, is set.

With regard to claim 11, it is pointed out that the original disclosure clearly does disclose the situation wherein the pressing device 30 is operated so as to set second distance 27. Moreover, this operation would be very similar to that disclosed in Fig. 2, although instead of pressing at end 8 of the bolt, the pressing device could be set so that it would press against end 9 as shown by arrow 22 in Fig. 1. Clearly the means which applies force 22 would have to be considered in arranging measuring feeler 35, but this is certainly within the skill of an ordinary artisan in this art.

With regard to paragraph 5 of the Office action, it is noted that changes have been made to all of the noted claims, which changes overcome these objections.

With regard to paragraph 7 of the Office action, it is pointed out that because the

Appl. No. 10/728,833
Amdt dated October 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of June 8, 2006

bolt 7 and plate 2 are joined by a press fit 6, they can slide with respect to each other if sufficient force is applied to either end, 8 or 9, of the bolt while the plate 2 is being held stationary. Likewise, the press fit 6 could be adjusted if bolt 7 were held stationary while sufficient force was applied to plate 2. Thus clearly either defined size, 24 or 27, could be set for the armature 1.

With regard to the examiner's next objection, it is pointed out that one skilled in the art would realize that feeler 35 could be arranged at end 8 of the bolt 7, or, with proper awareness of the requirements brought about by pressing at end 9 of the bolt, measuring feeler 35 could be left at end 9.

Moreover, just as the specification schematically represents force 22 at end 9 of the bolt in Fig. 1, it would be understood that feeler 35 could be positioned at end 8, or, with proper recognition of the requirements for applying force 22 at end 9, the feeler could stay at end 9. The specification, at paragraph 30, states that measuring "feeler 35 is located opposite end 9 of the armature bolt". The specification never states that feeler must be positioned opposite pressing piston 40.

With regard to the examiner's statement concerning claim 12, the examiner must realize that in this regard, the specification is somewhat schematic with regard to setting the alternative second distance 27. But clearly, with bolt 7 sliding with respect to plate 2 via press fit 6, (or vice versa) either distance 24 or 27 could be set by the pressing device 30 and measuring system 38.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge a fee of \$120.00, for a first month extension of time as specified in the fee schedule for 2006, or any other necessary fees

Appl. No. 10/728,833
Amdt dated October 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of June 8, 2006

in connection with this communication, to Deposit Account Number 07-2100.

In as much as the examiner expressed in paragraph 11 of the Office action that claims 5 and 10 are allowable, now claims 5 and 1 respectively, which are all of the independent claims presently in this application, and since all of the objections to the claims, specification and drawings have been overcome by this response, entry of this amendment and allowance of all of the claims are courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 10, 2006

Ronald E. Greigg
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,517
Customer No. 02119

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. (703) 838-5500
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/SLS/ja

J:\Bosch\R303598\06-10-10, R303598, Amdt re OA of June 8, 06.doc